

have \$250 million or larger in assets—and we are cutting Nutrition Programs and School Lunch Programs and WIC Programs.

In the other end of that, they want to give capital gains tax breaks which will go to the richest 1 or 2 or 3 percent in this country, in large part. The great majority of capital gains, 87 percent of capital gains cuts, go to the wealthiest people in this country.

This whole Contract With America disturbs me, Mr. Speaker, because it is transferring money from the middle class to the rich. It doesn't make sense and I ask for the defeat of the rescission bill this week.

UNHEALTHY KIDS DO NOT MAKE A STRONG AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of my Republican colleagues were busy this past weekend, as were by colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle. I wish some of my Republican colleagues who have proposed these cuts in programs might have accompanied me on my trip through Illinois.

My first stop was at a convention in Chicago sponsored by the Illinois Education Association, one of the largest groups of teachers in our State. Almost a thousand teachers met for a 3- or 4-day conference in Chicago to talk about issues on their mind.

I sat down for breakfast in Chicago with Gary Jones, a high school teacher in Troy, and Cindy Klickna from Springfield, IL, and I said, "What is different about this convention?" And they said, "The budget moved through quickly and we are glad to see that. But there is another thing that started coming up in the course of these conversations which is becoming more and more popular." And I said, "What is that?" And they said, "Security in schools."

Teachers who for years have been meeting and talking, scarcely talked about the question of security of teachers and students in schools. But now it has become an issue of paramount importance, not only in the city of Chicago but across the State.

All of us understand as we read in the newspaper about violence among kids. Children bringing knives and guns to school. Unfortunate and tragic incidents involving injury and death, schoolchildren one to another and threats to teachers. This is today's reality.

The reason why this is relevant is that this week on this floor of this House of Representatives we will be considering a Republican rescission bill, which is a spending cut bill, which will cut money for what is known as Safe and Drug-Free Schools. Money that we have put into a special account in the Federal Government to give to

school districts to figure out ways to make it safer for our children and grandchildren to go to school.

I wish we didn't have to do this. I wish we could put the money into computers and teachers. But every one of us knows in our heart of hearts that more than anything we want our kids coming home at the end of the day safe. Safe. And yet we are going to cut millions of dollars out of that.

The Republicans believe this is thoughtful; this is sensible. They don't think this investment is necessary. I wish a few of them could sit down with the teachers in today's schools who will tell you that taking the weapons out of schools, stopping the fighting in schools, and ending the drugs that are starting to permeate all of our kids' culture is really the key to security and the key to America's future and readiness.

I went back to Springfield, IL, which is in my district, and had another meeting and this meeting consisted of people representing the WIC Program, day-care homes, and school lunch programs. My friend the gentleman from Ohio, SHERROD BROWN, has talked about the school lunch program. I will not dwell on it.

At that meeting we talked a lot about what day care means to working mothers and fathers. A young couple in their 20's came in to see me with their children; one was 3 and another in a toddler seat. Both of them are working, and that is not unusual in America today, and they depend on quality day care to take care of their kids while they are off to work.

The Republican proposal on welfare reform is going to cut the nutrition grants which we give to day-care centers and homes across America. This is in the name of saving money. What these families told me was: Congressman, if the cost of day care gets up too high, it does not make sense to work. We are working to pay day care. We want to work. We want to pay taxes and we want to improve our lives and buy our homes and prepare for our future. But do not make an additional burden on day care, which is literally going to pull the plug on a lot of working families.

In Quincy, a week ago, there was a woman working 45 hours a week in fast food who had her daughter in day care who said, "If you are going to raise my day care bill 20 percent, I have to stop and really think does this make sense anymore?"

In the midst of a welfare debate we should be encouraging people to work. We should be helping them to stay on the job. We should not be increasing the overhead costs of going to work.

The same thing is true on the WIC Program. Here is a program which is a dramatic success—40 percent—40 percent of the infants in America are in our Federal WIC Program. And you know why it is such a big program? It works.

We have dropped the infant death rate in America. It should go even

lower, but we have dropped it dramatically because we bring in pregnant mothers. You meet early on with a counselor who says, "Here are the things you should put in your diet to have a healthy baby. And here are the things to avoid: Alcohol, narcotics and tobacco, especially."

And it works. We know it works. It is a proven success. And yet, the Republicans are coming in with their new vision of America to cut out these programs and reduce the amount of money we put in them. You know when we are going pay for that cut? Generations to come. Unhealthy kids do not build a strong America. We have got to stick with the programs that work. And I hope my Republican colleagues will get back to their districts and take a look around.

THE RESCISSION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will consider the rule and the bill on rescissions. That \$17 billion cut will begin to fundamentally change the way the Federal Government acts and responds, but more importantly, will begin to change the fundamental way we respond to Americans.

While I suspect both will pass, I intend to oppose both the rule and the bill. The rule is too restrictive. First, it only allows the restoration of programs through other cuts within the same chapter. And second, the rule restricts cuts to those programs already proposed to be cut. In short, the rule is designed to ensure that the disproportion in cuts proposed cannot be changed.

According to the analysis of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, low-income people will bear 63 percent of the cuts, where they only account for 12 percent. And over 12 percent of the total budget is paying 63 percent of the cuts proposed. The rule makes it virtually impossible to correct that imbalance of the shift of more burdens to the poor.

I cannot support such a rule, Mr. Speaker. Again, I cannot support such a rule that reverses in such a basic and elemental way the way in which we provide for the quality of life for the poor that Americans have come to expect and in fact, have come to rely upon.

The rescission bill would change how poor people eat, where poor people live, and where the poor people work, and what they can learn, and where they can travel, and how poor people can attend to their health care when they are in need.

It should be noted that the quality of life for poor people cannot be changed

significantly or dramatically without affecting the quality of life of all of us. We all live in America and as they are affected, we are also affected.

If poor become poorer in our society, the resources from those of us who are affluent and rich certainly will be drained. If poor people are not involved in the mainstream of our economy, the mainstream of America will suffer as a consequence of that.

In our blind rush to change things, it seems that we are ignoring these changing factors. To review some of these changes, let's consider that again according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the low-income elderly will be the hardest hit by a rescission. Why? Because the low income energy assistance program will be eliminated from these cuts. More than half of a million senior citizens will no longer have assistance in the cold of winter for heating purchases.

Also the low-income housing assistance program will also be drastically reduced. Poor children will be hit very, very bad by this bill. Excluding the housing and the energy assistance programs, \$5 of every \$6 proposed for the cut will affect children and youth. Children and youth thus far will face a double hit, because they also are assisted by the assistance for housing and also for fuel assistance.

More importantly, to receive no assistance means that low-income families with children must bear a disproportionate burden. The availability of housing for the poor will be made far more difficult if, indeed, the rescission package goes through.

These are fundamental changes in the quality of life of our citizens. While poor children will be cold, they may also be malnourished. Despite facts and statements to the contrary, more cuts in nutrition will indeed, occur, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the opposing side is saying that that will not happen.

Consider this fact: The WIC program will be cut by \$25 million in this rescission package, even before we get to the welfare reform next week. So to suggest that we are not cutting, we are going to make sure that children, pregnant women, and the very small suffer the most.

Why are we doing this? Where is the rationale for making these drastic cuts? In a sense, Mr. Speaker, we are imposing unfunded mandates on the States. I submit to you, by cutting these funds we are shifting the burden from the Federal Government to the States. And it will be, indeed, the expectation of the poor and those who have come to rely on these, they will now go to the States or to their local Governor expecting them to bear up this burden.

The States will have very little, I suspect, in responding to those who are cold in the winter, who are ill-housed. Therefore, Mr. Speaker we should not be doing this.

Funding for safe and drug-free schools, as my colleague has just mentioned to you, will be drastically cut. Some \$482 million will be lost, including \$9 million, Mr. Speaker, from my State of North Carolina. And for those lucky enough to receive training, they will not have jobs to go to because transportation will be cut.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the rescission bill really is a contract for disaster for poor people in America.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Pour down upon us, gracious God, the mercies and the judgments of Your word. Where we have missed the mark, grant us correction; where we have denied Your spirit and gone our own way, grant us forgiveness; when we have spoken the truth and done good works, give us encouragement; when we feel alone or in need of Your healing care, grant us Your abiding peace. We place before, O God, our prayers and the secret petitions of our hearts asking that Your word speak to us in the depths of our being. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] objects to the

vote on the ground that quorum is not present and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on the question will be postponed until 5 o'clock this afternoon.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FUNDERBURK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF REVIEW PANEL OF THE OFFICE OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Pursuant to the provisions of rule LI, the Chair appoints to the review panel of the Office of Fair Employment Practices the following employees of the House of Representatives: Ms. Elizabeth Haas, legal counsel, Office of the Clerk; and Mr. Randy Johnson, workplace policy coordinator, Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states the following:

On the first day of Congress, a Republican House will require Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else; cut committee staffs by one-third; and cut the Congressional budget.

We kept our promise.

It continues that in the first 100 days, we will vote on the following items: A balanced budget amendment—we kept our promise; unfunded mandates legislation—we kept our promise; line-item veto—we kept our promise; a new crime package to stop violent criminals—we kept our promise; national security restoration to protect our freedoms—we kept our promise; Government regulatory reform—we kept our promise; commonsense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits—we kept our promise; welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence; family reinforcement to crack down on deadbeat dads and protect our children; tax cuts for middle-income families; Senior